

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 13, 15, 20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-31, 35, 37, 42, and 44 have been resubmitted. Claims 1, 5, 13, 20, 23, 27, 35, 42, and 45 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5, 13, 20, 23, 27, 35, 42 and 45 have been amended to recite:

“..., wherein said node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point.”

Support for these amendments may be found in Applicants' specification at paragraph 0059.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 23, 25, 26 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236903 (Piotrowski) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 (Millier et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143817 (Dutta et al.). Independent Claims 1 and 23 have been amended to recite:

“..., wherein said node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point.”

The cited references contain no teaching or suggestion that a node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point. For example, Piotrowski teaches that the priority is determined by a user. See Piotrowski at paragraphs 15, and 19.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, and 23 and all claims dependent thereon, are not rendered unpatentable by the cited references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7-9, 27, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236903 (Piotrowski) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,995 (Millier et al.), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,937 (Gutle), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,841 (Sumita), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143817 (Dutta et al.). Independent Claims 5 and 27 have been amended to recite:

“..., wherein said node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point.”

The cited references contain no teaching or suggestion that a node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point. For example, Piotrowski teaches that the priority is determined by a user. See Piotrowski at paragraphs 15, and 19.

Accordingly, independents Claims 5 and 27 and all claims dependent thereon are not rendered unpatentable by the cited references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 15, 35, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236903 (Piotrowski), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143817 (Dutta et al.). Independent Claims 13 and 37 have been amended to recite:

“..., wherein said node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point.”

The cited references contain no teaching or suggestion that a node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point. For example, Piotrowski teaches that the priority is determined by a user. See Piotrowski at paragraphs 15, and 19.

Accordingly, independents Claims 13 and 37 and all claims dependent thereon are not rendered unpatentable by the cited references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236903 (Piotrowski) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,937 (Gutle), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,841 (Sumita), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143817 (Dutta et al.). Independent Claims 20 and 42 have been amended to recite:

“..., wherein said node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point.”

The cited references contain no teaching or suggestion that a node priority is set based on a characteristic of the appearance of said node when displayed. For example, Piotrowski teaches that the priority is determined by a user. See Piotrowski at paragraphs 15, and 19.

Accordingly, independent Claim 20 and 42 and claims 22 and 44 dependent thereon are not rendered unpatentable by the cited references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236903 (Piotrowski), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143817 (Dutta et al.), in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0013046 (Katayama). Claim 45 has been amended to recite:

“..., wherein said node priority is set such that the priority of nodes closer to a branching point in said tree structured document is higher than that of nodes more remote from said branching point ...”

The cited references contain no teaching or suggestion that a priority of a prioritized portion be based on a characteristic of the appearance of said node when displayed. For example, Piotrowski teaches that the priority is determined by a user. See Piotrowski at paragraphs 15, and 19.

Accordingly, independent Claim 45 is not rendered unpatentable by the cited references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236903 (Piotrowski) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0013046 (Katayama), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143817 (Dutta et al.), further in view of “Ellipsis” (Wikipedia). Claim 46 is dependent on claim 45, which is patentable for the reasons cited above.

Appl. No. 10/667,712
Amdt. Dated August 20, 2009
Reply to Amendment of May 20, 2009

Accordingly, Claim 46 is not rendered unpatentable by the cited references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections with respect to the rejected Claims is requested. Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 090441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2009 By: /Donald L. Wenskay/
Donald L. Wenskay
Attorney Registration No. 32661

LAW OFFICE OF DONALD L. WENSKAY
16909 Via de Santa Fe, Suite 202
PO Box 7206
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
Phone 858-756-0357
Fax 858-756-0427